

AN EXAMINATION OF BEHAVIORAL MOVEMENT AND ITS RELEVANCE IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: ISSUES AND PROSPECTS

Matthew Funsho Bello¹

Keneth Mela²

¹ Gombe State University, Gombe – Nigeria

² Federal University Gashua, Yobe State, Nigeria

*Corresponding Email: matthewfbello@gmail.com

Citation: Bello, M.F. & Mela, K.. (2023). An Examination of Behavioral Movement and its Relevance in Public Administration: Issues and Prospects. *KIU Interdisciplinary Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(1), 290-309

ABSTRACT

The behavioral approach to public administration owes its genesis to the Human Relations Movement of the 1930s. The movement started off as a protest to the traditional approaches to public administration that focused on organizations, institutionalization, rules, and code of conducts etc. with absolutely no mention of people who are the center of all these activities. The pioneering work done by Taylor and the emergence of Scientific Management created quite a stir not just in the industrial sector but also in management and study of public administration. The proponents of the Behavioral Public Administration (BPA) movement call for a greater use of theories in psychology and experimental research designs to improve rigour of public administration (PA) research. Limitations inherent in traditional orientations of analyzing administrative phenomena are reasons behind the search for new paradigms aimed at increasing epistemic knowledge when analyzing administrative issues in the 21st Century. Against the existing institutionalists, pluralists and elitists' approaches, contemporary thinkers have adopted the behaviouralist approach which has capacity to increase the empirical status of knowledge in contemporary administrative analysis. Using secondary sources like textbooks, scholarly journals, unpublished texts, the paper critically evaluates most of the criticisms levied against the behavioural approach with the view to identifying the edge which the behavioural approach offers contemporary analysts in public administration. The paper revealed that despite these criticisms, not all the examples of the approach are flawed. Behaviouralism has brought with it, new concepts, sophisticated tools of analysis and mathematical models which tend to make us all behaviouralists. It is our recommendation in this paper that behavioural principles in public administration should be upheld among researcher within the discipline of public administration.

Keywords: Behavioral Movement, Public Administration, Experiments, Relevancies of behaviouralism, Organizations.

INTRODUCTION

Behavioural movement came into existence in the discipline of public administration in the late 1930s and early 1940s along with the Human Relations Movement. These movements primarily dealt with human element in the organization which was not given due importance previously by the classical scholars. However, the former has a bearing with the inter-personal relationships of the organizational employees while the latter deals with the inside of human being having focus on the place of his values and sense of rationality'. Behaviouralism believed in the philosophy that understanding of inside of the man is as important as inside of the organization. A comprehensive understanding of organizational working is difficult without an inside understanding of its employees.

Initiated with the Human Relations Movement it was later extended and developed by Chester Barnard and Simon. This movement in this discipline gained popularity after Second World War. This approach primarily focused on the study of human behaviour in different administrative settings. It emerged as an alternative to provide realistic description of how people actually behave in the organization. It considers administrative system as a pattern of behaviour that depends on a network of human relations. It emphasizes on conducting and promoting scientific research relating to human behaviour. Various scholars adopted this approach while conducting several cross-national, cross-cultural, cross-temporal and inter-institutional studies in administrative behaviour. These studies ultimately proved significant in the development of the sub-discipline of comparative public administration.

Herbert Simon was one of the torch bearers of this moment and stated that administrative behavior is part of behavioral sciences and the study of public administration cannot be complete without the study of individual and collective human behavior in administrative situations. The behavioral approach has certain salient features like: The literature that has been written on the topic stays away from being prescriptive. It follows a descriptive course with an exception to the studies carried out in the areas of motivation Individuals were paid attention to and aspects like motivation, decision making, authority and control were brought into focus The informal aspects of an organization and communication patterns amongst the members were emphasized The effort was to identify operational definition of terms and a lot of empirical study like field study, laboratory study and statistical methods were conducted. It borrows a lot from other social sciences, social psychology and cultural anthropology.

This approach made more sense and had greater relevance than earlier approaches as it took into consideration the fact that the political, social, economic and psychological environments have an effect on human motivation and which ultimately has an effect on the work output of an individual. It also helped to develop an understanding of what,

how and why of the way the public administrators act. It showed that the way administration is conducted is influenced by human sentiments, presumptions biases and perception, which many of us may have experienced firsthand during our interaction with government organizations and public administrators. Behavioral approach has contributed to the study of public administration in many ways like the scholars started studying cross-structural and cross-cultural administrative behaviors and which further paved the way for the comparative study of public administration.

Like all new things, this approach too has its fair share of criticism and the critics have ruthlessly questioned the utility of this approach in the analysis of administrative problems. They find it limited in scope and of little use. The study of public administration goes beyond small social groups and deals with large communities and therefore the behavioral approach falls short.

The modern behavioral approach is leaning towards becoming more action oriented and prescription format nevertheless. Roscoe Martin and his Craft Perspective define the shift better. It concerns itself with the decisions, outcomes and the political skill needed to perform a particular managerial job.

However, the behavioural approach also called the socio-psychological approach is basically concerned with the scientific study of human behaviour in diverse social settings. The approach grew out of the criticism against the traditional approaches which laid emphasis on descriptive analysis rather than substantive one. In public administration, behaviouralism dates back to 1930's with the human relations movement and was later popularized by Chester Irving Barnard, Herbert Alexander Simon and others. Simon argued that 'Administrative behaviour' is part of behavioural science movement and the only difference lies in the subject-matter of various disciplines. He said, 'before a science can develop principles, it must possess concepts' this was however, after critically examining the principles of public administration. In his book, administrative behaviour, Simon rejects the traditional approach and holds that public administration should be concerned with the study of human behaviour in organization.

Despite these early attempts, Behaviouralism in public administration was systematically developed only after the Second World War, particularly through the writings of Elton Mayo, M.P. Follet, Chester Barnard, Herbert Simon, David B. Truman, Robert Dahl, Evron M. Kirkpatrick, David Easton, Heinz Eulau; are some of the most prominent personalities of the Behavioral movement in public administration.

Statement of Research Problem

Behavioural movement which challenged the Historical and the Institutional Approaches in Public administration is not widely understood by many researchers in the field of public administration. The main focus of Behaviorism is to make the study of Public administration Scientific. While behaviorism has been acted and applied in research by many scholars in public administration, there are number of scholars who doubt the usefulness of behaviourism.

Research Objectives

The general objective of this paper is to examine behavioural movement in public administration while the specific objectives include:

- a. To examine the concept of behavioural movement in public administration
- b. To discuss factors which contribute to the emergence of the behavioural movement in public administration.
- c. To examine the main features of behavioural movement in public administration.
- d. To analyze certain criticisms of the behavioural movement in public administration movement.
- e. To ascertain the contributions of behavioural movement in public administration

Research Questions

- a. What are the factors which contribute to the emergence of the behavioural movement in public administration?
- b. What are the main features of the behavioural movement in public administration?
- c. What are the strengths of behavioural movement in public administration?
- d. What are the Limitations of behavioural movement in public administration?
- e. Could there be any contribution of behavioural movement in public administration?

Conceptual Clarification

Grimmelikhuisen, et. al (2016) define Behavioral Public Administration as the “interdisciplinary analysis of public administration from the micro-level perspective of individual behavior and attitudes by drawing on recent advances in our understanding of the underlying psychology and behavior of individuals and groups.” The focus of BPA is on psychological processes underlying perceptions, attitudes and behaviors of citizens, public employees, and elected officials. Proponents of the BPA movement argue that although the founding fathers of PA, in particular Herbert Simon, Robert Dahl, and Dwight Waldo, envisioned a close integration between in PA and psychology, the PA scholarship has largely overlooked theories and methods of psychology until recently.

Bransah (2020) observed that Herbert Simon was one of the torch bearers of this moment and stated that administrative behavior is part of behavioral sciences and the study of public administration cannot be complete without the study of individual and collective human behavior in administrative situations. The behavioral approach has certain salient features like: The literature that has been written on the topic stays away from being prescriptive. It follows a descriptive course with an exception to the studies carried out in the areas of motivation Individuals were paid attention to and aspects like motivation, decision making, authority and control were brought into focus The informal aspects of an organization and communication patterns amongst the members were emphasized The effort was to identify operational definition of terms and a lot of empirical study like field study, laboratory study and statistical methods were conducted

Behavioral approach borrows a lot from other social sciences, social psychology and cultural anthropology. This approach made more sense and had greater relevance than earlier approaches as it took into consideration the fact that the political, social, economic and psychological environments have an effect on human motivation and which ultimately has an effect on the work output of an individual. It also helped to develop an understanding of what, how and why of the way the public administrators act. It showed that the way administration is conducted is influenced by human sentiments, presumptions biases and perception, which many of us may have experienced firsthand during our interaction with government organizations and public administrators. Behavioral approach has contributed to the study of public administration in many ways like the scholars started studying cross-structural and cross-cultural administrative behaviors and which further paved the way for the comparative study of public administration (Bransah 2020).

From the above, we can opine that the modern behavioral approach is leaning towards becoming more action oriented and prescription format nevertheless. Roscoe Martin and his Craft Perspective define the shift better. It concerns itself with the decisions,

outcomes and the political skill needed to perform a particular managerial job.

Grimmelikhuijsen, et. al (2016) described behavioral public administration as the interdisciplinary analysis of public administration from the micro-level perspective of individual behavior and attitudes by drawing on recent advances in understanding of the underlying psychology and behavior of individuals and groups. This definition has three main components:

- I. Individuals and groups of citizens, employees, and managers within the public sector are the unit of analysis;
- II. It emphasizes the behavior and attitudes of these people; and, most importantly,
- III. It does so by integrating insights from psychology and the behavioral sciences into the study of public administration.

By micro level, Klein and Kozlowski (2000) argued that the unit of analysis focuses on psychological processes within or between individuals what psychologists call intra- and inter-subjectivity. The micro level is typically embedded within the meso (e.g., organizational) and macro (e.g., institutional roles) levels

Jilke (2015), opine that, behavioral public administration studies the behavioral micro foundations of public administration through theories developed in psychology and the behavioral sciences more broadly. Behaviouralism for Walton seeks to examine “the behavior, actions, and acts of individuals – rather than the characteristics of institutions such as legislatures, executives, and judiciaries – and groups in different social settings and explains this behavior as it relates to the political system. (Walton,1985).

Base on the above definition, we can observe that Behavioural approach refers to the scientific study of human beings in diverse administrative settings. The subject matter of this approach is human behaviour and it derives all conclusions there from. It tries to understand why officials and public employees act as they do. It applies various tools from behavioural science to understand human behaviour in varied administrative situations. Instead of focusing on rules and regulations; it conducts scientific study of individual and group behaviour in different cultural contexts. To this end the organizations have been viewed as a social system where interpersonal relations among the employees and their informal communication are given due weight. It is believed that understanding of internal dynamics of administration has a direct bearing with the behavioural understanding of its employees.

According to Easton (1962) the intellectual foundations of Behaviouralism consist of

eight major tenets:

- a. Regularities: Discoverable uniformities in political behaviour which can be expressed in theory-like statements.
- b. Verification: Validity of such theory like statements can be verified.
- c. Techniques: Means for acquiring and interpreting data.
- d. Quantification: Precision in the recording of data.
- e. Values: Objective scientific inquiry has to be value free or value neutral.
- f. Systematization: Close interrelationship between theory and research.
- g. Pure Science: Directed towards forging a link between theoretical understandings of politics and application of theory to practical problem- solving.
- h. Integration: Integration of political science with other social sciences.

Thus Behaviouralism came to accord primacy to higher degree of reliability vis-à-vis higher degree of generality. In short, Behaviouralism focused on micro level situations rather than attempting macro level generalizations.

The method of studying Public administration before the World War II was largely unscientific and largely descriptive. According to Truman (1951), Public administration as a discipline before behaviouralism was characterized by six features:

1. A lack of concern with administrative behavior as such, including the American Political System which amounted in most cases to taking their properties and requirement for granted.
2. The absence of an explicit conception of administrative change and development that was blindly optimistic and unreflectively reformist.
3. The almost total neglect of theory in any meaningful sense of the term.
4. The consequent enthusiasm for a conception of science that rarely went beyond raw empiricism.
5. A strongly parochial preoccupation with things American that stunted the development of an effective comparative method, and
6. The establishment of a continuity commitment to concrete description (Truman,

1951)

RESEARCH METHOD

The researcher adopted qualitative method of research finding. Hence, qualitative method allows for proper appraisal of process that enables critical evaluations of information gathered from secondary sources. Materials gathered and used in this paper were collected from secondary sources of data such as textbooks, scholarly journals, unpublished text, Lecture notes, internet sources etc. The choice of this method is informed by the focus of the paper which is difficult to gather information from other sources within a shortest time frame of this research work.

MAJOR CONTRIBUTORS OF BEHAVIOURAL MOVEMENT

Elton Mayo: The genesis of Behaviouralism in Public Administration can be traced to the Elton Mayo's Hawthorne Experiments, conducted during 1928-32. These experiments succeeded in highlighting the importance of human dynamics in administration by challenging the mechanistic character of the classical scholars work. The Hawthorne studies not only confirmed the existence of informal organizations within formal structure but also brought to light the importance of human relations in influencing the organizational performance. Prior to him, the writings of Follet inspired new thinking in this discipline. Her contribution to the development of behavioural approach cannot be overlooked.

Rather, her writings can be regarded as precursor to the human relations as well as behavioural movement. In her famous work entitled "Dynamic Administration", she introduced concepts like law of situation, constructive conflict, democratic leadership, power authority and control etc. which led to inspire scholars from Harvard Business School under the leadership of Elton Mayo to conduct a series of experiments popularly known as Hawthorne Experiments. The findings of these experiments resulted in providing a serious jolt to the classical and scientific management thinking.

Mayo's Most Famous Early Experiment

The Mule Spinning Enquiry: He undertook the first research programme in 1923 and 24 in a textile mill near Philadelphia and named it "The First Enquiry". Its purpose was to identify the cause of high labour turnover in the Mule Spinning Department. Turnover in other departments was between 5 and 6% a year but as high as 250% in the Mule Spinning Department. Why so? He asked. Mule is a spinning machine in the textile industry.

Mayo decided to introduce two minute rest periods, one in the morning and two more in the afternoon for one of the groups in the department with astounding result. Morals

improved, high turnover ended, and production, despite the work breaks, remained the same. Soon the entire department (i.e. all the groups in the department) were included in the rest period experiment, and output increased tremendously. Monthly productivity, which had never been above 70%, rose over the next five months to an overall average of 80%, and with this increase came bonus pay, which was given for productivity over 75%. Mayo felt that it was the systematic introduction of the rest periods which helped to overcome physical fatigue leading to the high morale, high productive, and virtual elimination of labour turnover.

In a nutshell, like most of his colleague Mayo's initial interests were in fatigue, working conditions, rest periods, accident and labour turnover. Also paramount in his research was the importance of group in affecting the behaviour of individuals at work which enabled him to make certain deductions about what managers ought to do.

After this pioneering work of Mayo came the Hawthorne studies of which Mayo himself was one of the experimental with others, although Mayo was not the originator of the Hawthorne studies or even one of the chief researchers. He only joined the Harvard University industrial research faculty in 1926. He then conducted the Hawthorne Experiment together with the Harvard associates.

The Hawthorne Studies (1924-1932)

The Hawthorne studies formed the basis for the rise of human relations theory. These studies shook the foundations of classical approach, that is, the concept of economic man and the role of the structure of formal organization. These studies were conducted in the Western Electric Company at Hawthorne (near Chicago USA) by the Harvard Business School under the leadership of Elton Mayo.

The studies were conducted in the following four phases.

- a. Illumination Experiment (1924-27), to determine the effect of different levels of illumination on workers' productivity. In this experiment, some workers were placed under different light intensities starting with high light in their working place. The workers increased their output. The light intensity was adjusted downwards at different stages of the experiment but productivity continued to increase. The experimenters were baffled to get result contrary to their expectation. The workers' productivity reduced only when the light was reduced to moonlight level. This indicated that there is no much correlation between lighting and productivity. The workers output continued to be high despite the reduction of the light intensity until it reached moonlight level. The indication,

here, is that the workers were motivated psychologically by their being recognized for an experiment among others.

- b. Relay Assembly Test Room Experiment (1927), to observe the effects of various changes in working conditions on the workers' output and morale. In this experiment, some female workers (experimental group) were isolated from the rest (control group) and placed under observation with special good working conditions. Their level of productivity under diverse working conditions was carefully measured. But under all physical changes in their work environment (like less or more room lighting, rest pauses in work etc.), the production by these girls showed a continually upward rise. This proved that there was no positive correlation between the working conditions and productivity, invalidating another Taylorian dictum and this greatly puzzled the researchers. However, the reason for the behavior of the female workers seemed hardly surprising on further analysis. The girls were conscious of the fact that they had been selected for a special experiment. Hence, it was little wonder that they tried to give their best performance.
- c. Mass Interviewing programme (1928-31), to explore the employees' feelings (i.e. human attitudes and sentiments) by talking to them (ventilation therapy).
- d. Bank Wiring Experiment (1931-32), to understand better how the norms that controlled each member's output, were established by the worker's social group (informal organization). In this experiment workers operating under a piece-rate system were observed to see whether higher wages motivated them to work more. The group established their own norms and set their own standards of performance different from that of their organization. A high performing worker was named a Rate Buster, a low performing worker was named Chiseller and the worker who carried information of workers to management was named Squealer. The researchers were considerably surprised to find that the workers worked to a point they felt would ensure them of an adequate income, and then refused to work more, thus giving a lie to a well-known Taylorian principle. The main reason for this unexpected behavior was the underlying fears that overproduction may lead to retrenchment, a situation which any of them might have to face. The researchers discovered that the workers were a well-knit social group who were governed by their own code of work ethics informally agreed to by all members.

Chester Barnard: The human relations movement was further strengthened by Chester Barnard with the publication of his landmark work entitled "The Functions of the Executive" in the late 1930s. He remained associated with the New Jersey Telephone

Company in several capacities and had rich administrative experience. Essentially, he belongs to the Human Relations School and is prominent among those who realized the importance of human element. However, within this school, 'he may be said to be the initiator of the behavioural approach.' He begins his analysis with the premise that people enter into cooperation with each other in small and large group to realize the goals which otherwise could not be possible as individuals. Thus, he tried to develop a comprehensive theory of cooperative behaviour in formal organizations. He considered an organization as a social system. To him, an organization is nothing but a system of consciously coordinated activities of two or more than two persons. His definition of organization led him to his discourse on communication and authority. He was of the view that the executive could transmit the purpose of organization and understand the needs of the employee only by keeping communication channels open. He suggested that formal authority is little more than the willingness to communicate. His new insights resulted in challenging the various aspects of classical theory and contributed in launching the behavioural revolution in the study of public administration.

Herbert Simon: was the next contributor to this approach in the field of public administration. He was very much influenced by the pioneer works of Follet on group dynamics in organizations and Human Relations approach of Elton Mayo. Besides this, Barnard's famous work (Functions of the Executive) also had deep imprints on Simon's thinking. In essence, many of Barnard's ideas are found in Simon's prime work Administrative Behaviour. Simon tried to provide a sound basis to this approach. He wrote an article Proverbs of Administration in which he shattered the classicists' claim of universality of the principles of public administration. He called these principals no better than "proverbs". He finds that the principles evolved by the classicists were applicable only in contextual settings and thus, are inconsistent when applied to actual organizational situations. He was of the firm belief that the traditional theories apart from narrow in scope lack realism. He opined that whole of the orthodox public administration requires serious reconstruction and proposes development of a new science of administration that should focus on behavioural issues.

The publication of Simon's seminal work Administrative Behaviour in 1947 led to provide further impetus to the behavioural movement in public administration. In this book he advocated behavioural research in administration. While highlighting "administrative behaviour" Simon observed that it is "a part of the behavioural sciences and the study of public administration should involve the study of individual and collective human behaviour in administrative situations". He developed two interrelated concepts: 'bounded rationality and satisficing' which basically constitute the core of his entire intellectual activity. These two concepts primarily focused on the limits of human and

organizational gathering and processing of information. These ideas discarded the concept of economic man and provide impetus to the behavioural study of organizations. In his book, he makes the assumption that administration can be reduced to science, 'simply by applying logic to organization and decision making'. He maintains that to be scientific "the study of administration must exclude value-judgments, concentrate on facts, adopt clear terminology, apply rigorous analysis and tests postulates about administrative knowledge within the bounds of science and observation". He opined that behavioural approach provides the right perspective and logically clear and precise methodology to study public administration

Since the early 1950s, many sociologists and psychologists contributed significantly in the development of behaviouralism in public administration. Abraham Maslow, Douglas McGregor, Rensis Likert and Chris Argyris, are some of the foremost behavioural scientists who used this approach in their respective fields. However, the contribution of these scholars has considerably enriched the subject matter of public administration and the development of behavioural approach in this discipline.

Mary Parker Follett (1868-1933): Mary Parker Follett is regarded as a bridge between the classical approach and the behavioural-human relations approach to organization. Unlike other contemporary theorists, she viewed organization as a social system and administration as a social process. She highlighted, for the first time, the sociological and psychological dimensions of administration and management. She brought out the human dimension of organization and pointed out the role of situational factors on organizational behaviour. Hence, Follett is looked at as the precursor (forerunner) of the behavioural-human relations approach to organizational analysis. Wren says that, "Chronologically, she belonged to the scientific management era and philosophically social man era.' As a classical thinker she believed in the universality of her principles of organization and as a behaviouralist-human relationist, she emphasised the significance of socio-psychological aspects of organizational behaviour. Urwick and Matcalf observed, "her conceptions were in advance of her time. They are still in advance of current thinking. But they are a goldmine of suggestions for anyone who is interested in the problems of establishing and maintaining human cooperation in the conduct of an enterprise."

Follett criticized the classical theory of administration mainly for its mechanical approach and for neglecting psychological dimensions of organizational behaviour.

Factors which Contributed to the Emergence of the Behavioural Movement in Public Administration

There were a number of factors which contributed to the emergence of the behavioural approach. As cited in William Bransah (2020), the major factors which contributed to the emergence of behaviouralism includes but not limited to the following:

The Chicago School: The birth place of the Behavioural School is the Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, USA. It was there that few political scientists under the leadership of Charles E. Merriam, pioneered the study of what we now know as the Behavioural Approach. Other pioneering personalities in the Chicago School included Harold Lasswell, V. O. Key Jr., David Truman, Herbert Simon and Gabriel Almond and others.

The Princeton School: The Princeton School was located at the Department of Political Science, University of Princeton, USA. Its research methodology is based on the behavioural approach. Its field of specialization was cross-cultural studies. Those associated with the Princeton School included James S. Coleman, Lucian Pye, Sydney Verba, Myro Weiner, Dankwart A. Roston and George I. Blankstern.

Foundations Fund Support: The re-orientation of Political Science methodology was assisted by an unprecedented flow of foundation funds. Those foundations active in providing funds for research on political science were the Ford, the Rockefeller and the Carnegie Foundations.

The Immigration of European Scholars into the USA: The policies pursued by the Nazi Government in Germany made many German Scholars to migrate to the US during the War. Scholars from other European Universities also moved to America during and after the War. These scholars arrived in America with intellectual techniques/methods, which helped behaviouralism to develop as a methodology.

Other factors that helped boosted the Behavioural approach included the encouragement of the American Political Science Association and the Social Science Research Council, the growth of survey methods, especially at the Survey Research Centre of the University of Michigan and the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University.

Features of Behavioural Movement in Public Administration

With the increasing use of the behavioural approach in Public Administration major changes were noticed in the vocabulary of administration. Such words include civil

service, bargaining, efficiency, effectiveness, conceptual framework, decision-making, functionalism, factor analysis, feedback, model, game theory, input/output, political socialization, political culture, political system, etc. This behaviouralism has made public administration an inter-disciplinary subject and fully integrated it into other social sciences.

As cited in Easton, (1962). The following are the salient features of this approach.

Analytical Approach: Behavioural approach is not an ideal approach as it does not believe in 'what should be' or 'what ought to be' rather it is an analytic approach and believes in 'what its is'. It conducts the analysis of human behaviour in different administrative settings. In contravention to the traditional outlook towards administrative problems and situations, this approach emerged as a 'new' way of looking at these problems or situations. It is essentially concerned with the scientific study of human behaviour.

This approach does not concentrate on "how the administrative functionaries should behave" rather it merely explains "how they actually behave?" Thus, it analyses the effectiveness of the behaviour of administrative functionaries operating in different administrative systems in a comparative

Interdisciplinary in Character: This approach believes in the interrelatedness of all social sciences and aims to make public administration 'interdisciplinary'. In the discipline of public administration, it draws heavily from different social sciences especially from sociology and psychology for analyzing administrative behaviour in different contexts. This phenomenon has been explained by Simon more precisely. According to him, this approach makes considerable use of propositions drawn from other social sciences and of empirical data on administrative behaviour to test such prepositions in organizational contexts.

Empirical Approach: This approach is centered on the human behaviour which cannot be tested in closed rooms. Thus, it believes in the field testing or conducting empirical analysis of human behaviour. To this end, it utilizes various direct methods of data collection like field observation, controlled field experiments and laboratory studies. For instance, if we wish to study the behaviour of Haryana Police officials, we cannot conduct this study in laboratories; rather we shall have to go in the field to gather the relevant information about their behaviour.

Complicated Subject Matter: The subject matter of this approach is very complex mainly because of two reasons. First, it deals with the study of 'human behaviour' which in

itself is very much complex and complicated and difficult to understand. A precise understanding of human behaviour of public functionaries operating in various administrative contexts is hard to claim. It is mainly because human behaviour is not static and thus less predictable. It changes with the change in time, place and setting. Secondly, this approach makes a heavy reliance on the concepts, tools, techniques and methods borrowed not only from the social sciences but also from physical sciences. This dimension further adds to the complexity of its subject matter.

Scientific in Character: Another important characteristic of this approach is that it is scientific in nature as it lays emphasis on empiricism and drawing realistic judgments. It aims at replacing value judgments by empirically tested facts. In its scientific enquiry, it studies human behaviour in various administrative settings. To this end, it utilizes scientific methodology, standardized techniques and verifiable procedures.

Besides, it utilizes mathematical models that impart a scientific status to this approach. Prof Arorastates said that this approach, to a great extent, is concerned with 'quantification, mathematization and formal theory construction' in the discipline of public administration.

Value Free Approach: Another important feature of this approach is that it is value-neutral in character. In analyzing human behaviour scientifically, behaviouralists keep their own values away from their studies. They believe that since values can't be scientifically tested or proved so they do not start with any preconception or value as it vitiates the findings.

In his own submission Truman (1951), put forward the following as the characteristics of behavioural approach to the study of public administration:

- a. The objective is to make the study of public administration scientific thus capable of explanations and predictions.
- b. The focus of study is on observable behaviour of individuals and groups in the administrative settings.
- c. The use of quantitative method is encouraged since this would assist in accurate measurement of data.
- d. Research is aimed at developing theories which could provide acceptable explanation for administrative behaviour.
- e. Research is, also, aimed at providing solutions to immediate social problems.

- f. Public administration is to be made more inter-disciplinary, embracing other social sciences.
- g. Research should employ statistical techniques such as multivariate analysis, sample surveys, mathematical models and simulation.

Criticism /Weakness of Behavioural Public Administration Movement

Like all new things, this approach too has its fair share of criticism and the critics have ruthlessly questioned the utility of this approach in the analysis of administrative problems. They find it limited in scope and of little use. The study of public administration goes beyond small social groups and deals with large communities and therefore the behavioral approach falls short.

Major critics of the approach included William Yandell Elliot, Edward Corwan, Luther Gullick, Walter J. Shepherd, James Hart, H. Mark Jacobson and Charles A. Bear (Gullick, 1956).

Although the impact of behavioural approach on the study of public administration is enormous yet this approach is not free from criticisms. It is generally criticized on the following grounds:

Scientificism a Hollow Claim: The critics argued that the behaviouralist's claim of 'scientificism' of this approach seems to be hollow. It is mainly because the human behaviour apart from complex is not quantifiable in precise terms. Thus its overall and comprehensive understanding in all respects is unexpected and unbelievable. It is mainly because the scientific study of human attitude, values, norms, perceptions and sentiments is very difficult. They cannot be measured in quantifiable terms in the absence of some well-developed yardstick. Further, comparison of behaviour of two or more administrative systems in diverse cultural settings is still more difficult.

Overlooking Historical Perspective: This approach emphasized on the behavioural understanding of the administrative functionaries indifferent administrative settings and examines 'how they actually behave' in these settings but ignores the factors that lead to the emergence/ creation of these settings. It also ignores the circumstances under which these functionaries have to discharge their work. Thus this approach gives least or no importance to the circumstances and the historical perspectives, that affects human behaviour and shape or reshape it. The behaviouralists should not be oblivious of the fact that most of our present is an outcome of the past.

Neglect of Values: This approach is further criticized for being value free. Behaviouralists

declare themselves as purists and value neutrals, but they do have a set of values as it is impossible to be value neutral. This approach is stated to be of very less importance as it is believed in the exclusion of values from the study of administrative phenomenon. However, 'any value free approach to public administration makes its study sterile and irrelevant to the vital issues of modern age.' Thus behavioural approach finds handicaps to explain the value laden or normative problems and issues of administrative organizations.

Long Range Venture: This approach is further criticized on the ground that it involves long-range ventures. The main tool of data collection of this approach is the method of observation. Consistent observation of the administrative behaviour of the administrative functionaries over a long time can lead to draw results. Moreover the accuracy and objectivity of data so collected through this method is also difficult to determine, thus data in behaviouralism is not much dependable.

Change in Circumstances: Since change is the law of nature, so the behaviour of the administrative functionaries undergoes change with the passage of time. Consequently, an administrative functionary is more likely to react differently to the same circumstances at different points of time. But such changes are least acceptable to this approach. Other criticism includes:

- I. Public administration is not, nor is it ever likely to become a science in any realistic sense of the term.
- II. Overt administrative behaviour tells only part of the story. Different individuals may perform the same act for quite different reasons. To understand what they do, one must go beyond or behind, observable behaviour. The anti-behaviouralist holds that the larger part of administrative life lies beneath the surface of human action and cannot be directly apprehended.
- III. Because administrative Behaviour is not quantifiable whatever the theoretical merits of quantification, it cannot make public administration scientific.
- IV. The pre-occupation with general theory tends to block less ambitious prospects but in the long run is more productive inquiry. At best, it has led to the proliferation of concepts which cannot be operationalized.
- V. Significant administrative issues involve moral and ethical issues. Public administration has historically been and must continue to be more concerned with questions of right and wrong even if these cannot be scientifically resolved.

- VI. There has been indiscriminate borrowing of concepts and techniques which are simply inappropriate for administrative inquiry.
- VII. As for 'Scientific Objectivity', there is almost universal skepticism among the anti-behaviouralist that it is attainable and considerable doubt that it is inherently desirable.

Relevance/Contributions of Behavioural Movement in Public Administration

Despite the weakness, behavioural approach contributes to administrative studies in the following ways:

Guides Scientific Investigations: This approach has proved significant in guiding and motivating scientific investigations in the field of public administration. As an outcome, scholars in public administration have attempted to utilize this approach as a main tool for conducting research on administrative behaviour of the public functionaries in a scientific way. For instance, various Indian scholars viz. PaiPanandikar, Kuldeep Mathur, Ramashray Roy, Shanti Kothari, and C.P. Bhambhari have taken initiatives in this regard.

Systematic Theory Construction: This approach lays emphasis on conducting studies about the behaviour of the administrative systems embedded in different cultural settings. It is mainly because the study of the behaviour of two or more administrative systems rooted in the same cultural setting will not much deviate from one another.

Therefore, if we conduct comparative studies of two or more administrative systems with same cultural settings, the comparisons would be of little significance to the literature of the discipline. In this way this approach plays a significant role in promoting inter-cultural or cross-cultural studies. However, in the field of comparative public administration very few such studies have been conducted more specifically by the western scholars such as Robert Presthus, and Michael Crozier.

Extension of the Frontiers of the Discipline: This approach succeeded in adding a new dimension to the literature of public administration. It promoted the interest of the scholars of public administration to conduct more and more research on this aspect in different administrative settings and cultural contexts. In this regard it heavily relies on the subject matter, tools, and concepts liberally borrowed from other disciplines like sociology, psychology, mathematics, political science etc. Consequently, the interaction of public administration with other disciplines enhanced significantly. This led to the generation of new concepts and knowledge which apart from broadening the vision of the students and researchers of public administration also contributed in the enrichment of its subject matter. Such inclination of public administration towards other disciplines

further proved more significant for the sub-discipline of comparative public administration towards making it more interesting.

Development of New Orientation: This approach further proved significant in providing a new orientation to administrative thought. It emerged as a challenge against traditional way of looking at administrative problems. This approach “was a ‘new’ way of analyzing administrative situations. It resulted into change in focus of attention of the scholars of public administration towards the role of individuals, group dynamics and leadership in organization etc. Now the organization is considered as a social system. Change in focus led to understand the basic urges, needs and demands of administrative functionaries in different organizational settings. Currently, ‘the findings and knowledge of behavioural studies are increasingly being used by organizational development practitioners in organizational redesigning and solving the organizational performance.’

CONCLUSIONS

Behavioural approach developed in late 1930’s and early 1940’s contributed significantly in development of public administration as a discipline. This approach focused primarily on human behaviour, role of individual in organization, motivation morale and satisfaction. These significant aspects were previously ignored by classical thinkers. Behavioural scientists are increasingly involved in scientific study of human behaviour and changing institutionalized human behaviour to fulfill the needs and goals of individual and organization.

REFERENCES

- Bransah, W. (2020), Behavioral Systems and Structural Functional Approach to Public Administration. *Scholarly Journal of Arts & Humanities: Dama Academic Scholarly & Scientific Research Society* @ <https://damaacademia.com/sjah/> March 2020 Pages: 07-13 Volume 2 Issue 3.
- Easton, D. (1962). "Introduction: The Current Meaning of "Behaviouralism". In Charles Worth,James. *Political Science*. Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science. p. 9
- Jilke, S. (2015). Essays on the Micro foundation of Competition and Choice in Public Service Delivery . PhD dissertation. Erasmus University Rotterdam.
- Klein, K. J. , & Steve W.J. K. (2000) . From Micro to Meso: Critical Steps in Conceptualizing and Conducting Multilevel Research. *Organizational Research Methods* 3 (3): 211 – 36.
- Grimmelikhuijsen, S., Jilke, S. & Tummers, L. (2016). Behavioral Public Administration:

Combining Insights from Public Administration and Psychology. An open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-No Derivs

Truman, D. B. (1951). *The Government Process*. New York: Knopf.